By JOSEPHUS DANIELS---

(Secretary of the Navy in Wilson's Cabinet.)

We Have Left George Washington's Warning Behind, Says Daniels, Vigorously Scoring Ratification of the Four-Power Treaty—Policies Now Shaped in Conjunction With Other Nations.

FOR better or for worse, for richer or for poorer, the United States has definitely departed from the teachings of Washington and entered into an alliance with two European nations and one Asiatic nation. The four-power pact takes us on seas uncharted by American captains of our Ship of State.

The day of isolation is over. The Atlantic and Pacific no longer constitute the coast line of our international interest and responsibilities. Indeed, in some measure, we stepped into world affairs when, after the Spanish-American war, we bought the Filipinos at so much a head and undertook the government at Porto Rico. We took another step when we bought the Virgin Islands and governed Haiti and San Domingo when, in 1915, they were in danger of annexation or domination by a European nation.

On April 6th, 1917, we formally, in spirit if not in word, declared that the warnings of Washington, wise in his day, no longer should guide us with reference to European governments. Changed conditions taught new duties. The dead hand could not control the living world. We became an ally and associate of all the nations fighting against German domination of the world.

COULD NOT TURN BACK.

Having taken that step in assuming a leading part in the world affairs, we could not turn back if we would and we would not if we could. President Wilson negotiated a treaty by which the United States became a member of the League of Nations, needing only the ratification of the treaty to give us the seat at the head of the table in restoring world stability. The Senate declined to ratify and the United States officially declared it would never disregard Washington's warning against taking part in European concerns.

And then we waited for a return to normal conditions. Farm products, lacking foreign markets at decent prices, fell below the cost of production. Factories, enlarged beyond national needs, closed down for lack of foreign markets. Millions walked the streets vainly looking for a chance to earn an honest living.

This was the condition in the fall of 1921. One day President Harding took a sea voyage on the Mayflower. All Presidents ought to go to sea oftener so they will have the best chance to think. Upon that short voyage, burdened with the deplorable conditions in his own and foreign nations, he resolved in his mind to carry out his rather vague pre-election promises of 'an Association of Nations," or some way of co-operation with other nations outside of going into the League. The six months in the great office had convinced him that Washington's warning was out of date. Unemployment and depression at home demanded that an attempt be made to secure the delayed prosperity. He was convinced that some measure of stability and confidence abroad must precede employment and success at home. The Anglo-Japanese alliance didn't look good to him, particularly as together their navies were able to control the seas. He wished it ended. What price would Britain and Japan extort for not renewing the alliance?

CALL APPROVED.

Then it was that President Harding, good editor that he is, seized a pad and grabbed his pencil calling the Washington conference to discuss reduction of armament as Mr. Borah had demanded, and added the settlements of the questions in the Far East. It was a happy thought. Parenthetically, may I not suggest that if President had taken another sea voyage he might have found a way to secure the soldiers compensation without the now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't policies which jeopardize any relief to the man who saved the world.

The calling of the Washington conference was cordially, even enthusiastically approved. The people of all creeds, seeing no relief except from association with foreign nations, rejoiced that certain world problems were to be talked over by great nations. Unless some help could come from this gathering, what could deliver us from the slough of despondency into which we had fallen?

The debate since the treaties were signed has run the whole gamut from demand for a strict adherence to the policy of no alliances or agreements or co-operation with any foreign nations, to a demand for Americas entrance into the League of Nations. The first passed forever April 6, 1917. The second was the logical conclusion, but the attitude of President Harding and the majority of Congress was such that it was understood to be out of the ques-

you ever wonder why it was that no delegate dared even so much as mention the League of Nations, or admit he knew such an association existed during the session of the Conference? If so, how did it happen that some one of the delegates, nearly all of whom had earnestly supported it and still believed it was the best remedy for world chaos, did not let slip out the fact that he had heard of the Covenant? They tell a story in Washington that upon the arrival in this country of the delegates they were told in blood-curdling tones that any allusion to the fact that such an animal existed would bring dire punishment upon the offender. They were made to understand that President Harding felt that, though the lion had been locked securely in its steel cage, he woke up in the night after a horrid dream in which he had seen the dreadful lion escape from the cage, enter the Conference, devour the delegates, and take control of the Conference. What a pity it didn't!! The alternative was an alliance or world chaos.

When ratification came, all the enthusiasm which made itself felt on the first day of the Conference had oozed out. Confidence in its good effects had fallen. The debate had aroused suspicions and fears in many minds. Many who still favored it did so because they felt the alternative was an alliance or chaos. They did not wish to see the Anglo-Japanese alliance renewed. They did not wish to become a partner with Japan. Between the two many, halting between two opinions, decided to accept the admitted danger in an alliance rather than reject the only bridge possible over which the world might crawl back to stability. The bridge is not one to their liking, but it is a bridge and it may be strengthened. To reject it was to return to competitive armaments or to be at sea with no chart or compass. An old ship with a poor rudder seemed better than none at all. That is the feeling which secured ratification plus—

HOPE FOR THE COVENANT.

And thereby hangs a hope still cherished by many in and out of the Senate. The seeds of trouble in the alliance are recognized. When Russia finds itself—and that great nation is sure to return to stability—and when Germany is again on its feet, and that productive people will win back prosperity—is there not danger of an opposition alliance on the part of these two great nations and other nations not admitted into this alliance? The Republican Senators could not vote now to enter the League, however much that course commends itself to their judgement. They fought it too bitterly in the last campaign to accept it now. Later, maybe, but not now. But in and out of the Senate most of the people who favored the alliance deep down in their hearts hope that it will be the beginning of co-operation with other nations which will grow into Mr. Harding's promised "association of nations." Who can tell?

"Perhaps it may turn out a song. Perhaps turn out a sermon."

Those Democratic Senators, who regretfully voted against it when they were unable to secure the perfectly essential reservation by which, for example, Russia should be called into the conference for discussion in the event of any disagreement with Japan, believe it is intended to make entrance into the league impossible. Indeed, some of them believe it was conceived for that very purpose, and that under its operation it will be found that these four powers intend by Big Stick methods to dominate the nations of the earth. Quite a number of Democratic Senators voted for it in the hope that it would prove a bridge toward a real league or understanding. There was no attempt at party line-up, every Senator voting his personal convictions. If the Robinson amendment had been accepted, as it should have been, nearly all the Democratic Senators would have felt justified in giving it the benefit of their serious doubts.

FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE.

Time alone can answer the question whether the alliance will bring the blessings desired or whether it conceals dangers to world peace which may prove that it is a Trojan horse. To be sure there is no danger of any great war in the near future. There would have been none with or without a conference. Therefore, if we have peace until the nations have caught their breath after the world war it will not be due to the alliance. We can see its fruits only after Russia regains its stability, after Germany is again fully at work after the Near East troubles are adjusted.

The barometer of its success or failure is China. That nation has been guaranteed its territorial rights and the withdrawal from Shantung and the exercise of sovereignty by other nations over China. The promises to "get out of China" have been made, but the various "provisos" and the many "conditions" create doubt as to when the sovereignty of China will be respected.

MUST COMPEL PERFORMANCE.

If China's sovereignty is not respected, if the steps necessary for good feelings in the Far East are not taken, what then? The alliance must compel such justice to China. How? By a talkfest which to be effective in case of serious differences must take the form of a Congressional authorization of force. For unless the pledges are performed the whole treaty will prove to be a farce. Performance must come. That will be the test. The logic was all against entering into a four-power alliance. The psychology was all in favor of it. Let us hope that psychology is right, and that there "ain't no such a thing as logic."

"War Showed Gold Standard Is Fallacious and Unjust," Says Caillaux

PARIS, April 1.—The theory that gold should be removed as a money basis has found a powerful backer in Joseph Caillaux, former premier of France, who is deemed one of the world's great economists.

"The most urgent problem confronting the world today is the ending of the present grotesque confusion of moneys," states Caillaux in his book. "The sole solution is the creation of a European banknote, based not on gold but on credits and international securities.

"The gold standard was faulty in its inception and it has remained as long as it has solely because the great casastrophe proving it fallacious was long in coming. But the war has shown that a system by which a floating gold supply can govern the richness or poverty of far-separated nations is a system not only fundamentally unjust, but one which in the end wreaks vengeance on its supposed beneficiaries.

"How explain the paradox that, while the French Government is one of the poorest in the world, the French nation is one of the wealthiest—if not the wealthiest—per capita? How explain that, in a country where almost every man has a modest bank account, the government cannot pay its debts?

"The answer is that the system of basing a nation's credit on the amount of base metal resting in its banks is not a true criterion of that nation's wealth."

Although, under decision of the high court, Caillaux is forbidden to live in Paris for five years and has lost his rights as citizen in perpetuity, the former premier states he is determined to "fight assiduously and with all my strength that my country may regain its former unshakable financial standing." To this end he has written and published a book, declared to be one of the most masterly analyses of economic conditions ever penned, called "Where is France Going? Where is Europe headed?"

Included in the book is a powerful appeal that France and the remainder of Europe enter immediately into commercial relations with Russia.

"Without Russia, Europe is slowly slipping into the miasma of ruin," he declared. Bankruptcy of the majority of European states cannot be avoided, but at least we can avoid the aftermath of misery which would otherwise be inevitable by preparing now to recement the commercial organization of Europe, so that when the crash comes we may emerge to find a solid foundation for the new economic structure already built."

LORD BEAVERBROOK ON THE MEN WHO FAIL

"Anyone Who Had Strayed in Youth to the Wrong Profession and Failed Might Yet Prove a Success in Another. Vice Versa, the Success in One Branch Might Be the Failure in Another. No Young Man, Therefore, Has Failed Until He Has Succeeded."

LONDON, April 1.—Among the articles on various phases of "Success" which Lord Beaverbrook has written, his latest article on "Men Who Fail" has received particular notice. The article appears in the Sunday Express:

By LORD BEAVERBROOK.

THE bitterest thing in life is failure, and the pity is that it is almost always the result of some avoidable error or misconception. With the rare exception of a man who is by nature a criminal or a waster, there need be no such thing as failure.

Every man has a career before him, or, at worst, every man can find a niche in the social order into which he can fit himself with success.

The trouble in so many cases is that it takes time and opportunity for a man to discover in what direction his natural bent lies. He springs from a certain stock or class, and the circumstances which surround him in youth naturally dictate to him the choice of a career.

In many cases it will be a method of living to which he is totally unsuited. But once he is embarked on it the clogs are about his feet, and it is hard to break away and begin all over again.

And this ill-fitting of men to jobs may not even embrace so wide a divergence as that between one kind of activity and business and another. A young man may be in the right business for him, and yet in the wrong department of it. In any case, the result is the same. The employer votes him no use, or at least just passable, or second rate. Much worse, the employe knows himself that he has failed to make good, and that at the best nothing but a career of mediocrity stretches out before him. He admits a failure, and by that very act of admission he has failed. The waters of despair close above his head, and the consequence may be ruin.

Such mistakes spring from a wrong conception of the nature of the human mind. We are too apt to believe in a kind of abstraction called "general ability," which is expected to exhibit itself under any and every condition.

According to this doctrine, if a man is clever at one thing or successful in one set of circumstances, he must be equally clever at everything and equally successful under all conditions.

Such a view is manifestly untrue.

SPECIALIZATION.

The mind of man is shut off into separate compartments, often capable of acting quite independently of each other. No one would dream of measuring the capacity of the individual for domestic affection by that of his power of oratory, or his spirituality by his business instinct. And what is true of the larger distinctions of the soul is also true of that particular part of the mind which is devoted to practical success.

Specialized aptitude for one particular branch of activity is the exception rather than the rule. The contrary opinion may, indeed, easily lead to grave error in the judgment of men, and therefore in the management of affairs.

There is no art in which either the barrister, the politician, or, for that matter, the journalist, excels so much as in the rapid grasp of a logical position, the power of assimilating great masses of material against it or for it, and of putting out the results of this research again in a lucid and convincing form. Anyone listening to such an exposition would be tempted to believe that here was a man of such high general ability that he would be perfectly capable of handling in practice, and with superb ability, the affairs he has been explaining.

INSTINCT AND LOGIC.

Yet such a judgment would be wrong. The expositor would be a failure as an active agent. It would not be difficult to find the exact converse to the case. The greatest of all the editors of big London newspapers would fail entirely to appreciate a careful and logical statement of a situation when it is submitted to him. But place before him the raw material and the implements of his own profession, and his infallible instinct for news will enable him to produce a newspaper far transcending that which his more logical critic could have achieved.

Leaving aside a few strange exceptions, a musician is not a soldier, a barrister not a bookkeeper, a poet not a business man, or a politician not a great organizer.

Anyone who has strayed in youth to the wrong profession and failed might yet prove himself an immense success in another, and these broad distinctions at the top ramify downward until the general truth is equally applicable to all the subdivisions of business and even to all the administrative sections of particular firms.

To take a single practical instance, there is the department of salesmanship and the department of finance. Salesmanship requires above all, the spirit of optimism. That same spirit carried into the sphere might ruin a firm. The success in one branch might therefore well be the failure in the other and vice versa.

No young man, therefore, has failed until he has succeeded.

ANCIENT ROMAN ROAD DISCOVERED IN PARIS

Workmen Laying Gas Pipes Unearth Flagstones Laid Centuries Ago in Section Now Occupied by the Famous "Latin Quarter" of French Metropolis.

THE remains of an old Roman way has been found in the Quartier Latin, Paris. A number of curious flagstones have been deposited in the cloisters of Saint-Severin—itself an old church standing on the site of an oratory of the time of Childebert in the sixth century, and mostly dating in its present form from the thirteenth century. Saint-Severin stands in a little street near the Quai, at the beginning of the Boulevard Saint-Michel, almost facing Notre Dame, says the Paris correspondent of the London Morning Post.

These dalles were found in the recent excavations in the Rue du Cimetiere Saint-Benoit, at the angle of the Rue Saint-Jacques. The excavations were not conducted by archaeologists. The necessity of laying down gas pipes led to the discovery. As a matter of fact, it is not the first time that in this vicinity Roman vestiges have been unearthed.

In 1920, in the Rue Saint-Jacques—in that part which runs from the Musee de Cluny with its Roman remains to the Rue Cujas, with the Roman Arenes de Lutece close by—sandstone blocks which had certainly belonged to an antique road were dug up. Last year similar stones were brought to light in the same rue at the corner of the Rue des Ecoles.

The greatest interest is being taken in these continual discoveries. A careful examination of the ground underneath the dalles shows that it was solidly constructed in stonework, rolled and compressed as are our roads today, with a certain amount of clay interposed between the stones.

In the Gallo-Roman epoch, that is to say, the third century or thereabouts, there existed in this part much marshland. It is considered that in order to cross these watery spaces it was found necessary to build a solid and fairly deep stone passage. Later a well-paved road was constructed. Afterwards the roadway was probably raised. There was fresh ballasting.

Indeed, a number of different epochs with higher and higher roadways are indicated. The Roman occupation of Lutece can be traced in its various stages.

The debris found in the topmost empierrement appears to date from the third century, but it is thought that the dalles which covered this last layer are more recent—probably being placed there in the fourth century.

The sandstone surface is regarded as the final attempt to repair and rebuild the Genabum road. The dalles evidently could have been brought from any part of France, but it is believed that the Romans found the material about the bed of the Seine.

Find Meteor in Oregon.

PRINEVILLE, Ore., April 1.—Workmen employed on the Ochoco dam found what seems without question to be a meteor. The body of rock is about five feet in diameter and was unearthed a short distance below the surface.

By LEON TROTZKY---

(The Bolshevik Army Chief Outlines His Field of Operations to Congress)

"Japan Throws Band After Band of Enemies Against Us—These Troops Are Officered by Japanese and Are Paid by Tokyo—Shall We Remove Our Troops From Siberia Under These Conditions?"

WE CAN now speak plainly of things which were considered but recently profound military secrets. At the period of the greatest development of our military forces, our army had in its ranks 5,300,000 men. We decided at first to reduce this figure to 2,700,000, but the general international situation gave us an opportunity to reduce it still more. As a result we now have a total effective force of 1,595,000, including the red fleet, the army proper consisting of 1,370,000 men.

To demobilize an army is not an easy task. It has no heroic incidents, no tales of deeds of valor. The general public scarcely notices it. But we military men know how a great demobilization strains every nerve of the army organism. We began the contraction with troops stationed in the interior; at first we reduced this part of the army to 70 per cent. Then we reduced the active forces. Now, when the army is all transferred to a peace footing, we can speak with definiteness as to its active strength. At the present time we have ninety-five infantry and forty-nine cavalry brigades.

We began by demobilizing the older men, those born in 1885, and finally reached those born in 1899. We were preparing to demobilize the class of 1899 as well, but there appeared signs of new perturbations, and we found ourselves obliged to exercise caution and stop the demobilization of this class. Consequently the soldiers of the class of 1899 were left in the ranks, since they have the greatest experience and technical knowledge.

This is the general scheme. It is now for the Congress of Soviets to say whether we are to continue demobilization or to interrupt it. The commissariat of war is certain that the red army is now eager to reach a stable peace footing, in order to devote all its attention to routine drill and instruction.

SOLDIERS MERE YOUTHS.

The red army is passing through a trying stage of its history. It has ceased to be active, and has ceased to be the center of public attention. Other urgent matters are taking precedence in the public mind, and the care given the army has become, to say the least, inadequate. Questions of equipment, of food, and of living quarters are acute even now, when the effective strength has been reduced to one-third of what it was before. No matter how poor we are, we can still do much for our young red army soldiers. We can make their life, as well as their barracks, clean, warm, and pleasant. The soldiers recently called to the colors are young. They have not passed through the school of battle. They must be taught, guided, and trained.

The red army is recruited from all ranks and classes. It consists of workmen and peasants, commissioned and noncommissioned officers of the last wars, and professional military men of the old regime. Nearly half, or 43.4 per cent, of the commanding personnel have never received any professional training. From the point of view of the old army methods, this is a great defect. But we can be proud of this percentage. These 43.4 per cent are the real heart of our commanding personnel. They are workmen and peasants, trained in battle, red officers of the revolution, who have not had time to receive special military education because the revolution tore them away from the factories and the fields and sent them to be trained in battle. They have had their training, and they have learned. That we know very well.

Former noncommissioned officers constitute 13 per cent, red commanders who have received special training 10 per cent, officers promoted during the war 22 per cent, military officials 6 per cent, officers of the cadre 5 per cent. The red army has been a huge melting-pot for this varying human material and has molded out of it the figures it needs. We have had to form our commanding personnel from all sources, including the former officers of the cadre. These officers have performed great services for us. We needed them. They gave us training, but at the same time they themselves learned much.

SUPPRESSING BANDITS.

As to social origin, the army is composed of the following groups: More than 67 per cent are peasants, 12 per cent are workmen, and the rest are from other classes. Remember this figure particularly, you peasant comrades; remember that more than 67 per cent of our active troops have come from your midst, and tell it in your villages.

Before the last inspection of the Communist party, 20 per cent of the commanding personnel consisted of Communists, whereas in the rank and file the Communists constituted 10 per cent.

During the current year the red army has been occupied mainly in suppressing bandits. The first half of the year was marked by a monstrous growth of bandit outrages. They occurred in Kronstadt, in Tambov, in Siberia, in the Caucasus, and in the Ukraine. This form of lawlessness has been practically stamped out.

But the second half of the year presents a different picture. There is a fundamental change in the situation. Not only have separate bands been destroyed, but the evil has been eradicated. This is due to the efforts of the Red army, coupled with our new economic policy. As far as the peasantry is concerned, the motives for these outrages have ceased.

A classical example of this is the Makhno movement. Petlura's department of foreign relations (there is really such a department!) recently informed the Petlura representatives abroad that when Makhno himself arrived in Rumania, he was asked about conditions in Russia. His reply was: "Makhno's detachments, after Wrangel's defeat, had to seek other allies in Russian territory. They tried the Don region, but found insufficient anti-Bolshevist forces there. Then they turned east to Antony, but found no help there. They tried Kursk, but encountered only scant sympathy. So they found themselves constrained to move their "forces" abroad."

NEED FOR BIG ARMY.

At first Makhno's detachments thought of going into Poland. Then they decided to go to Rumania. But does that make any difference? As far as Soviet Russia is concerned, Poland and Rumania are merely two rooms of the same house.

Why is it that we cannot reduce our army further? Here are some of the reasons:

In the district of the Black Sea we find a newly-formed "Black Sea committee for the salvation of Russia." British capital interested in oil and Italian capital interested in manganese are organizing the peasants of the Black Sea region to fight the Soviet government. The interests of the Baku workmen are so close to the hearts of this committee, that it organizes a special committee for the defense of the Baku oil fields from the workmen of Azerbaijan.

In the Far East, Japan has just taken Khabarovsk from us.

Poland openly violates the Riga treaty. For example, on October 6 the Soviet government received through its representative in Poland, Comrade Karakham, most peaceful assurances from the Polish government, and on October 26 hostile bands invaded Russia from beyond the Polish frontier. Such facts are numberless. Is it possible for this sort of thing to go on indefinitely? Such invasions may be called only pinpricks, but such pricks may become so numerous as to constitute a national danger.

Conditions on the Rumanian border are no different. Our peace negotiations with Rumania have been broken off, because Rumania would not promise to remain neutral in case a third power attacked us.

CASE AGAINST JAPAN.

Japan throws band after band of enemies against us. These bands are paid with her money and officered by her instructors. Here is an appeal of the government of the Far Eastern republic:

"For the fourth successive year Japanese bayonets violate the will of the Russian people in the Far East. Japanese fortifications have been built on the banks of Russian rivers, and the channels of these rivers have been mined with Japanese mines. On the island of Sakhalin, Japan rules as though it were her own territory, selling timber and other wealth belonging to Russia. The people of the Far East have more than once raised their voice in protest against these violations, but no one has listened to this voice."

That voice has not been heard by the capitalist countries, but it has been heard by the laboring masses of Soviet Russia. Great Britain, America, Japan and partly France rule the Pacific. On one of its shores are the domains of these powers; on the other is the territory of the Russian workmen and peasants. The four powers have concluded an agreement among themselves, and as a result the attacks on the Russian territory have increased, and these attacks are carried out by bands officered by the instructors of one of these powers.

We have just received telegraphic reports that the city of Khabarovsk has been captured with the aid of the Japanese bayonets. Under these conditions, shall we remove our troops from the territory of the Far Eastern republic? No; we can only regret that there are not enough of our troops there to defend our territories properly. But we are certain that the time will soon come when Red bayonets will be strong enough to repel the attacks of these insolent imperialist vultures.

ARMY OF 1,300,000.

As for Japan, our Red troops and Red partisans in the region of Khabarovsk will have a special conversation with her, and this conversation will not be carried on in the diplomatic language of the entente. But as for Finland, it is not yet clear whether she is intentionally violating the treaty which exists between us. It seems more likely that her government is simply floating with the current. She began by tolerating the attacks of outlaw bands upon us, and has now reached the stage of armed participation.

We need not repeat that we seek no conquests. It takes all the stupidity of European newspapers, ministers, and parliamentary talkers to assert that we want to attack anybody. That is falsehood and slander. We have an army of 1,300,000, and if we consider the extent of our territory and the peculiar conditions under which we have to maintain order in that territory, we shall find that our army is eighteen times smaller than that of France. Promising to pay the pre-war debts of the Czar's regime, we want to buy peace, not to engage in war. The whole bourgeois Europe knows that.

PREPARING FOR WORST.

Our propaganda in the army during the present winter will consist in explaining to the soldiers things as they are. And this is the picture: On the one side a desire for peace, and on the other a series of provocations. During the past few weeks the danger has increased, rather than diminished. We shall explain this clearly to every Red soldier. We shall prepare for the worst. The winter we shall devote to intensive study of military science. And by the summer we shall not be caught unawares. The possibility of bloody tragedies is not excluded. I do not wish you to misunderstand my statement. But it is better to see the danger—even, perhaps, to see more than there is. By spring and summer we shall be ready for peace. But if our enemies persist in attacking us, we shall prove, if we are forced to do it, that in 1922 it is easier to extend the frontiers of Soviet Russia than to contract them.

Bernard Shaw Tells Why Parliament Is No Magnet

LONDON, April 1.—George Bernard Shaw is just as determined not to become a member of Parliament as he is never to visit the United States.

The West Edinburgh Labor Party has just asked Mr. Shaw to stand as its candidate. He has replied:

"Why should I plead with the citizens of West Edinburgh to allow me to waste my time at Westminster for a salary on which I could not live, when I can command a far more eligible position and much larger emoluments as a leading member of my profession?

"If the Labor Party, or any other party, will guarantee me an unopposed election and a salary of $20,000 a year, with a handsome pension, I may at least consider the proposition that I should narrow my audience from civilized mankind to the handful of bewildered commercial gentlemen at Westminster who are now earnestly ruining Europe and trying the stupidest way of ruling their own country.

"But my answer would probably be the same—it would be easier and pleasanter to drown myself.

"At the same time I am very sensible of and grateful for the esteem which has prompted your invitation. I am well aware that I have a few friends in Edinburgh. It may be even a few thousands, but not enough to win the seat even if I wished to win it.

"You may therefore relieve the minds of all the foolish people in the country by announcing authoritatively that they have nothing to fear from me at the forthcoming general election. I shall not stand for Parliament, but for telling Parliament what I think of it and, incidentally, of the political intelligence of the people who elect it.

"That is a useful and necessary occupation, but not one that wins votes."